UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/677,095	09/30/2003	Martin Tewes	34874-064 UTIL	4091

64280 7590 03/03/2009
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER	
BURGESS, BARBARA N	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2457	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
03/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/677,095	TEWES ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	BARBARA N. BURGESS	2457

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2009.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-16 and 20-22 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-16, 20-22 is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
  1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
  3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Request for Continuation Examination (RCE) filed February 13, 2009. Claims 7, 17-19 have been cancelled as requested by Applicant. Claims 1-6, 8-16, 20 are presented for further examination. Claims 21-22 are newly added and presented for initial examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4-5, 12-14, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Green et al. (hereinafter “Green”, US Patent Application 2003/0009418 A1) in view of Higgins et al (hereinafter “Higgins”, US Patent Publication 2002/0116505 A1).

As per claim 1, Green discloses a framework for communicating between a central message exchange server and one or more heterogeneous external data sources, comprising:

an adapter engine (paragraphs [0020, 0023]);

generating a message that conforms to the one or more extensible markup language protocols used by the central message server, the message comprising at least part of the data (paragraphs [0023-0024]);

persisting a message identifier designating the message, the persisted message identifier being used for re-sending the message in case of delivery failure (paragraphs [0025-0026]);

passing the message to the central message exchange server and receiving, from the central message exchange server, a confirmation acknowledgment that informs the inbound adapter that the message has been received by the central message exchange server (paragraphs [0026-0028]).

Green does not explicitly disclose:

an inbound adapter, the inbound adapter being instantiated upon receipt of data at the central message server from the one or more heterogenous external data sources, the data comprising a data format that is native to the heterogeneous external data source and not compliant with one or more extensible markup language protocols used by the central message exchange server;

the inbound adapter generating a message;

the inbound adapter passing the message to the central message exchange server.

However, in an analogous art, Higgins teaches a content provider (central server) having a protocol adapter to convert between the internal data format of the content provider and a server data format (format used by heterogenous external data sources). The content provider's format is that of XML. The protocol adapter converts the data from the calendar format to that suitable by the content provider (paragraphs [0009, 0039-0040, 0043, 0054, 0060]),

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Higgin's inbound adapter in Green's system in order to retrieve requested content.

As per claim 4, Green discloses the framework in accordance with claim 1, wherein the external data source and the central message exchange server communicate via a hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) (paragraph [0020]).

As per claim 5, Green discloses the framework in accordance with claim 1, wherein the central message exchange server operates using a simple object access protocol (SOAP) (paragraph [0020]).

As per claim 12, Green discloses the framework in accordance with claim 7, wherein the inbound adapter includes an HTTP client, and the outbound adapter includes an HTTP server (paragraph [0020]).

As per claim 13, Green discloses the framework in accordance with claim 1, wherein the adapter engine includes a Java application configured to communicate via HTTP (paragraph [0020]).

As per claim 14, Green discloses a method for communicating between central message exchange server and one or more heterogeneous external data sources, comprising:

Receiving data at the central message server from the one or more heterogenous external data sources (paragraphs [0020, 0023]);

generating a message that conforms to the one or more extensible markup language protocols used by the central message server, the message comprising at least part of the data (paragraphs [0023-0024]);

persisting a message identifier designating the message, the persisted message identifier being used for re-sending the message in case of delivery failure (paragraphs [0025-0026]);

passing the message to the central message exchange server through the inbound adapter (paragraph [0023]);

processing a confirmation acknowledgement upon receipt of the message by the central message exchange server to prevent the message from being sent (paragraphs [0026-0028]).

Green does not explicitly disclose:

an inbound adapter, the inbound adapter being instantiated upon receipt of data at the central message server from the one or more heterogenous external data sources, the data comprising a data format that is native to the heterogeneous external data source and not compliant with one or more extensible markup language protocols used by the central message exchange server;

the inbound adapter generating a message;

the inbound adapter passing the message to the central message exchange server.

However, in an analogous art, Higgins teaches a content provider (central server) having a protocol adapter to convert between the internal data format of the content provider and a server data format (format used by heterogenous external data sources). The content provider's format is that of XML. The protocol adapter converts the data from the calendar format to that suitable by the content provider (paragraphs [0009, 0039-0040, 0043, 0054, 0060]),

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Higgin's inbound adapter in Green's system in order to retrieve requested content.

As per claim 21, Green discloses the framework in accordance with claim 1, further comprising an exchange infrastructure that is implemented on one or more processors and that comprises the central message exchange server and the adapter engine (paragraphs [0020, 0023]).

3. Claims 2, 6, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Green et al. (hereinafter "Green", US Patent Application 2003/0009418 A1) in view of Higgins et al (hereinafter "Higgins", US Patent Publication 2002/0116505 A1) and in further view of Callan et al. (hereinafter "Callan", US Patent Application 2008/0133263 A1).

As per claim 2, Green, in view of Higgins, does not explicitly discloses the framework in accordance with claim 1, providing the data in an XML message to the central message exchange server.

However, the use and advantage of using such XML message is well-known to one of ordinary skill as evidenced by Callan (paragraph [0049]).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Callan's XML message in Green's framework in order for a request to be interpreted by the server.

As per claim 6, Green discloses the framework in accordance with claim 2, wherein the external data source includes a sending application (paragraphs [0022, 0027]).

As per claim 15, Green, in view of Higgins, does not explicitly discloses sending the data to the central message exchange server in an XML message.

However, the use and advantage of using such XML message is well-known to one of ordinary skill as evidenced by Callan (paragraph [0049]).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Callan's XML message in Green's framework in order for a request to be interpreted by the server.

4. Claims 3, 8-9, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Green et al. (hereinafter “Green”, US Patent Application 2003/0009418 A1) in view of Higgins et al (hereinafter “Higgins”, US Patent Publication 2002/0116505 A1) and in further view of Halahmi et al. (hereinafter “Hal”, US Patent 6,684,088 B1).

As per claim 3, Green, in view of Higgins, does not explicitly discloses the framework in accordance with claim 1, wherein the one or more adapters include an outbound adapter configured to receive data in an XML message from the central message exchange server, extract the data from the XML message, and send the data to the external data source in the native message format.

However, the use and advantage of sending such XML message to the external data source in the native message format is well-known to one of ordinary skill as evidenced by Hal (column 6, lines 11-18, 26-35, column 8, lines 41-47, column 10, lines 41-51).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Hal’s sending XML message to the external data source in the native message format in Green’s framework in order for the receiving device to display the message.

As per claim 8, Green, in view of Higgins, does not explicitly discloses the framework in accordance with claim 1, wherein the adapter engine further includes an adapter monitor for monitoring the operation of each adapter and presenting monitoring information to a graphical user interface (GUI).

However, the use and advantage of monitoring operation of each adapter is well-known to one of ordinary skill as evidenced by Hal (column 7, lines 1-10).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Hal's monitoring in Green's framework in order to display portions of the email message.

As per claim 9, Green, in view of Higgins, does not explicitly discloses the framework in accordance with claim 8, further including a GUI engine for generating the GUI and displaying the monitoring information.

However, the use and advantage including a GUI engine is well-known to one of ordinary skill as evidenced by Hal (column 7, lines 1-10).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Hal's GUI engine in Green's framework in order to display portions of the email message.

As per claim 10, Green discloses the framework in accordance with claim 8, further including an information log for logging the monitoring information (paragraph [0028]).

As per claim 11, Green discloses the framework in accordance with claim 8, further including an identification log for logging message identifiers of each message communicated through an adapter (paragraph [0029]).

As per claim 16, Green, in view of Higgins, does not explicitly discloses the method in accordance with claim 14, wherein the adapter is an outbound adapter, and the method includes receiving data in an XML message from the central message exchange server and sending the data to the external data source in a format native to the external data source.

However, the use and advantage of sending such XML message to the external data source in the native message format is well-known to one of ordinary skill as evidenced by Hal (column 6, lines 11-18, 26-35, column 8, lines 41-47, column 10, lines 41-51).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Hal's sending XML message to the external data source in the native message format in Green's framework in order for the receiving device to display the message.

5. Claims 20, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halahmi et al. (hereinafter "Hal", US Patent 6,684,088 B1) in view of Higgins et al (hereinafter "Higgins", US Patent Publication 2002/0116505 A1).

As per claim 20, Hal discloses a method for communicating between central message exchange server and two or more heterogeneous external data sources, comprising:

instantiating an adapter corresponding to each of the native data formats (column 3, lines 30-36, column 4, lines 50-60);

and an outbound adapter configured to receive data in a second message from the central message exchange server and send the data to each one of the heterogenous external data source in the native data format of the heterogenous external data source (column 3, lines 30-36, column 4, lines 50-60);

connecting each of the one or more heterogenous external data source to the central message exchange server via the adapter that corresponds to the native data format of the heterogenous external data source (column 6, lines 10-30, 44-60, column 9, lines 1-5);

communicating data between the one or more heterogenous external data source and the central message exchange server through the adapter (column 10, lines 1-10, 46-48).

Hal does not explicitly disclose:

an inbound adapter, the inbound adapter being instantiated upon receipt of data at the central message server from the one or more heterogenous external data sources, the data comprising a data format that is native to the heterogeneous external data source and not compliant with one or more extensible markup language protocols used by the central message exchange server;

the inbound adapter generating a message;

the inbound adapter passing the message to the central message exchange server.

However, in an analogous art, Higgins teaches a content provider (central server) having a protocol adapter to convert between the internal data format of the content provider and a server data format (format used by heterogenous external data sources).

The content provider's format is that of XML. The protocol adapter converts the data from the calendar format to that suitable by the content provider (paragraphs [0009, 0039-0040, 0043, 0054, 0060]),

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Higgin's inbound adapter in Green's system in order to retrieve requested content.

As per claim 22, Hal discloses the framework in accordance with Claim 21, wherein the exchange infrastructure further comprises an integration repository that captures design-time collaboration descriptions of a plurality of internal components of an enterprise and external components of the enterprise that can communicate via the exchange infrastructure, an integration directory that captures configuration-specific collaboration descriptions of all of the internal components and external components at runtime, and an integration server that comprises the central message exchange server and the adapter engine (column 4, lines 50-60, column 6, lines 10-30, 44-60, column 9, lines 1-5).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BARBARA N. BURGESS whose telephone number is (571)272-3996. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00am-4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Barbara N Burgess/
Examiner, Art Unit 2457
February 24, 2009

/LaShonda T Jacobs/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2457